

Allied Landfill Outreach Plan EPA reengagement with citizens

1. Phase 1 – Reengagement – more output than input
2. Phase 2 – Presentation of new alternative – output
3. Phase 3 – Proposed Plan/public comment period –output

1. Phase 1

a. Goals

- i. Check-in with Public – A conversation on the issues
- ii. Define the role of the public moving forward – *work in progress – (would they want us to define their role? Perhaps we just remove this goal?)*
- iii. Communicate with public before the product is finished
 1. Showing the work in progress
 2. Inclusion before alternative included in FS
- iv. Address technical concerns
- v. Seek input on Monarch and immediately south of Alcott (I'm not in the loop as to what this is – is this the green space you were telling me about that the City showed as woods? If so, is this a detail we need to get into hear in order to move forward with integrating the alternative or something we can get into in design phase.

b. Engagement mechanisms –

- i. Stakeholder outreach with smaller groups
 1. Preview of upcoming meeting
 2. Collect and answer concerns/questions (inform 1. a. iii.)
- ii. Public meeting
 1. Format – Presentation, Q&A then informal discussion around posters
 2. Message –
 - a. Check-in – EPA drawn to process
 - i. Value collaboration with local governments
 - ii. EPA values stewardship of remedies - City could provide that here
 - b. Communicate that process is unfinished
 - i. Walk through site constraints
 1. Monarch conditions
 2. Floodplain issues
 3. Building of the mound
 4. What we don't know
 - ii. Show both configurations, but explain that EPA favors the mound because of better stewardship
 1. Plateau can be fall-back option
 - iii. Show unfinished Skeo treatment of Mound with Redevelopment
 - iv. Show Monarch and Area north(see my comment above – I think we don't need this level of detail or feedback

right now. I'm not really sure of a good way to collect it holistically at this time)

1. Current conditions
2. Conditions after remediation
3. Monarch as a water control area
4. Potential Sequencing of these areas first

c. Address Technical concerns

- i. From city meeting
- ii. Subset from earlier FAQs
- iii. Collected from stakeholders in early Phase 1

d. Address the money questions

- i. What is the role of available funds?
- ii. Previous statements about money by public
 1. Just \$7M a year
 2. Other

iii. webpage

1. Share Technology letter
2. Post FAQs
 - a. Prioritize and get some up there

2. Phase 2 – Presentation of the Alternative going into the FS

- a. Finished Skeo treatment of Mound

3. Phase 3 – Proposed Plan and Public Comment Period

Diane's Counter proposal:

1. Phase 1 – Reengagement – more output than input
2. Phase 2 – Presentation of new alternative – output
3. Phase 3 – Proposed Plan/public comment period –output

1. Phase 1

a. Goals

- i. Check-in with Public – **to inform** on where we've been and where we are now
- ii. What we've heard from the city's process (**to share** SKEO's MOCKUP)
- iii. **To communicate** with public there is still more to do before the product is finished and added to FS
 1. Showing the work in progress
 2. Inclusion before alternative included in FS (additional engineering calcs?)
 3. Site constraints
 4. Address technical concerns
 5. **Seek input on Monarch and immediately south of Alcott??**
- iv. **To communicate** next steps

b. Engagement mechanisms –

- i. Products: FAQ, Posters (of what?)
- ii. webpage
 1. Share Technology letter
 2. Post FAQs
 - a. Prioritize and get some up there
- iii. Stakeholder outreach with smaller groups
 1. Preview of upcoming meeting
 2. Collect and answer concerns/questions
- iv. Public meeting
 1. Format – Presentation, Q&A then informal discussion around posters
 2. Message –
 - a. Check-in –
 - i. EPA drawn to process
 - ii. Value collaboration with local governments
 - iii. EPA values stewardship of remedies - City could provide that here
 - b. Show unfinished Skeo treatment of Mound with Redevelopment
 - i. **Show Monarch and Area north**
 1. **Current conditions**
 2. **Conditions after remediation**
 3. **Monarch as a water control area**

4. Potential Sequencing of these areas first
- c. Communicate that process is unfinished
 - i. Walk through site constraints
 1. Monarch conditions
 2. Floodplain issues
 3. Building of the mound
 4. What we don't know
 - ii. Show both configurations, but explain that EPA favors the mound because of better stewardship
 1. Plateau can be fall-back option
 - iii. Address Technical concerns
 1. From city meeting
 2. Subset from earlier FAQs
 3. Collected from stakeholders in early Phase 1
 - iv. Address the money questions
 1. What is the role of available funds?
 2. Previous statements about money by public
 - a. Just \$7M a year
 - b. Other
- d. Communicate next steps
 - i. Discuss what EPA will do next if everyone is in agreement (how will we determine this? Are we going to tell the public somehow that we listened from these meetings and then make a decision or can we tell them then and there our intentions given no major heartache is expressed) ex. EPA intends to move ahead with engineering calcs to fit into the FS and we will present you with those details in about a month)

Commented [RD1]: To me, introducing this breaks the flow of the concept of "Process being unfinished" By introducing this, it could be understood that since the process is unfinished, EPA could just use this instead of the City option. I think as a member of the public, the city spent time talking about our compromise, we talked about our compromise (at the beginning of this meeting) and then we say, "well, if you want, we can throw the compromise out and do this instead". That is confusing and may appear we are being disingenuous. In addition, we don't really have a clear way to collect input if people like/dislike this vs city option. How would we discern if they preferred it? Just the rumblings in the crowd? Have posters in the back that they can mark up like the city meeting? Have comment cards with the statement, "Do you like plateau or mound?" If we collect data, how will we be able to compare it to what the city collected and decide which they like? Are we making an arbitrary choice for the public based on the limited amount of information they shared with us? Ultimately I think it moves us away from our communication goals that you defined at the top. But – if it is a deal breaker for you, I will organize with it in mind.

2. Phase 2 – Presentation of the Alternative going into the FS
 - a. GOALS:
 - i. **To inform** of EPA's integration of alternative into FS
 - ii. **To inform** of the details of this alternative in context of how other alternatives were presented.
 - iii. **To share** Finished Skeo treatment of Mound
3. Phase 3 – Proposed Plan and Public Comment Period
 - a. GOALS:
 - i. **To inform** public of EPA's preferred alternative
 - ii. **To collect** public comment on proposed plan